

REMARKS

As a preliminary, Applicant and Applicant's representative thank the Examiner for the interview of December 3, 2008.

By the present amendment, terms and expressions objected to have been amended as listed below.

Further, claim 1 has been amended by incorporating therein the subject matter of claim 4, and claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form.

Accordingly, claim 4 has been canceled.

Claims 1-3 and 5-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 10 are the only independent claims.

I. Indefiniteness rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

The claims have been amended to remove terms and expressions objected to as indefinite. In particular, the following objections have been addressed as follows:

- Claim 1: "adapted to determine" replaced by "determining"
- Claim 1: "to calculate" replaced by "calculating"
- Claim 1: "so as to perform" replaced by "wherein the system performs"
- Claims 2-3: "is adapted to immobilize" replaced by "immobilizes"
- Claim 4: "makes it possible to determine" replaced by "determines" (incorporated into claim 1)

- Claim 5: “makes it possible to analyze” replaced by “analyzes”
- Claim 5: “so as to avoid taking” replaced by “without taking”
- Claim 6: “the corresponding sensor” replaced by “the sensor of the longitudinal deceleration of the vehicle”
- Claim 8: “so that” replaced by “, wherein”
- Claim 9: “so as to apply” replaced by “and applies”
- Claim 10: “calculating the speed of the vehicle from each calculated value of the deceleration” by “calculating a speed of the vehicle for each wheel from each calculated value of the deceleration”
- Claim 10: “the sensor” replaced by “the wheel rotation speed sensor”
- Claim 10: “performs an average of the four calculated values of the speed of the vehicle” replaced by “calculates the speed of the vehicle by performing an average of the four calculated values of the speed of the vehicle for each wheel”
- Claim 13: “if” by “when” (two occurrences)
- Claim 15: “is adapted to immobilize” replaced by “immobilizes”
- Claim 16: “is adapted to immobilize” replaced by “immobilizes”

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Art rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-8, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6,019,436 to Siepker (“Siepker”) in view of US 6,199,964 to Ota et al. (“Ota”).

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the subject matter of claim 4, which is not

Amendment
U.S. Appl. No.: **10/544,209**
Attorney Docket No. **PSA0301487**

included in this rejection, and further, claim 10 which is not included in this rejection has been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 502759.

Respectfully submitted,

/nicolas seckel/

Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Nicolas E. Seckel
Patent Attorney
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 669-5169
Fax: (202) 822-1257
Customer No.: 29980
NES/rep